

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 12-24 are pending in this application. Currently claims 15-20 are withdrawn from further consideration. By this Amendment, claims 6, 21 and 22 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank Examiner Chang for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative during the July 11 personal interview. The substance of the interview is incorporated into Applicants' response.

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claim 6 is amended to obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

During the interview, Examiner Chang indicated that claims 21 and 22 are indefinite. Claims 21 and 22 are amended to increase their clarity.

Claims 15-20 are currently withdrawn from the consideration. However, because claims 15-20 depend from claim 21, these claims should be rejoined and allowed upon allowance of claim 21.

The Office Action rejects claims 21, 9, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,016,953 to Moss et al. (Moss); and rejects claims 21, 9, 13, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,707,585 to Tanaka. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the interview, neither Moss nor Tanaka teaches or suggests the features of amended claim 21. In particular, neither Moss nor Tanaka teaches or suggests receiving a reconstructed beam diffracted from the hologram, determining whether an intensity of the reconstructed beam has decreased to a predetermined value or less, and subsequently re-recording and retaining the reproduced information in the optical recording medium, without changing the reproduced information, when the intensity of the

reconstructed beam has decreased to the predetermined value or less. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is patentable over Moss and Tanaka.

Similarly, as discussed during the interview, neither Moss nor Tanaka teaches or suggests determining whether the number of times of reproduction of the information from the predetermined position has exceeded a predetermined value, and subsequently re-recording and retaining the reproduced information in the optical recording medium, without changing the reproduced information, when the number of times of reproduction has exceeded the predetermined value, as recited in claim 22. Thus, claim 22 is patentable over Moss and Tanaka.

Claims 9, 13 and 22-24 are patentable for their dependence on claims 21 and 22, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tanaka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,806,982 to Newswanger et al. (Newswanger). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of canceled claims 2 and 3 is moot.

Newswanger does not overcome the deficiencies of Tanaka. Therefore, claims 1 and 4-7 are patentable for their dependence on claim 21, as well as for the additional features they recite.

At least for these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tanaka and Newswanger, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,890 to Kawano et al. (Kawano). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kawano does not overcome of the deficiencies of Tanaka or Newswanger. As such, claim 8 is patentable for its dependence on a patentable base claim, as well as for the

additional features it recites. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tanaka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 is patentable for its dependence on a patentable base claim, as well as for the additional features it recites. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tanaka in view of Kawano. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kawano does not overcome the deficiencies of Tanaka discussed above with respect to claim 21. As such, claim 14 is patentable for its dependence on a patentable base claim, as well as for the additional features it recites. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:KXH/hs

Date: July 14, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461